

1 Jennifer K. Hostetler  
 2 Nevada Bar No. 11994  
 3 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP  
 4 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
 5 Las Vegas, NV 89169  
 6 Tel: 702.949.8200  
 7 JHostetler@lewisroca.com

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff PlayUp, Inc.*

9  
 10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 11 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

12 PlayUp, Inc., a Delaware Corporation,  
 13 Plaintiff,  
 14 v.  
 15 Dr. Laila Mintas, an individual,  
 16 Defendant.

17 Case No. 2:21-cv-02129-GMN-NJK

18 **PLAINTIFF'S EMERGENCY**  
 19 **MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTED**  
 20 **SERVICE OF DR. LAILA MINTAS**

21 Plaintiff, PlayUp, Inc. ("PlayUp"), by and through its undersigned counsel, Lewis Roca  
 22 Rothgerber Christie LLP, hereby submits this Emergency Motion for Substituted Service of  
 23 Dr. Laila Mintas (the "Motion"). This Motion is made and based upon the following  
 24 Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the attached exhibits, all pleadings and papers on  
 25 file in this action, the Declaration of Jennifer K. Hostetler ("Hostetler Decl."), attached as Ex.  
 26 12, and any oral argument that this Court might entertain at the hearing on this motion.

27 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

28 On December 3, 2021, the Court entered its Order granting Emergency Motion for Ex  
 29 Parte Temporary Restraining Order ("Order") (ECF No. 11) temporarily restraining  
 30 Defendant, PlayUp's former CEO, from engaging in any conduct or making any statements  
 31 that disparage or portray PlayUp in a negative light or otherwise impair the reputation or  
 32 commercial interest of PlayUp and breaching Section 6(e) of her Employment Agreement.

33 In the Order, the Court required that PlayUp serve Defendant with a copy of the Order  
 34 by December 6, 2021. (ECF No. 11 at 14).

35 On December 6, 2021, PlayUp filed a Motion for Extension of Time seeking an

3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
 Las Vegas, NV 89169

**LEWIS ROCA**

3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

LEWIS ROCA

1 additional 14-days to serve Defendant with the Order after the following attempts to serve  
2 Defendant. (ECF No. 13):

- 3 • **12/2/2021 at 2:00 pm:** Process server went to the last known address of  
4 Defendant, 11 Mountain Cove Court, Henderson, NV 89052 (the “Property”)  
5 and a male “came to the door and peeked through the unfrosted part of the door  
but didn’t say anything and just walked away.” *See* 12/6/2021 Affidavit of Due  
Diligence, attached as Ex. 1.
- 6 • **12/2/2021 at 6:42 pm:** Process server went out to Defendant’s Property and  
7 after no answer, drop served the documents on Defendant’s front steps. *See*  
12/6/2021 Affidavit, attached as Ex. 2
- 8 • **12/3/2021 at 10:55 am:** Process server went out to Defendant’s Property and  
9 spoke to an unknown male at the Property who stated “he is performing a home  
inspection and home is vacant and [Mintas] is believed to have moved to the  
10 Bahamas.” *See id.*
- 11 • **12/4/2021 from 8:45 am - 5:15 pm:** PlayUp retained an investigator that  
12 conducted surveillance of the Property. He further rang the doorbell, knocked  
13 on the door, looked through the front door. Defendant was not observed. *See*  
14 Report, attached as Ex. 3.
- 15 • **12/3/2021 and 12/4/2021:** Australian counsel engaged in email  
16 communications with Defendant and notified her of PlayUp’s attempts to serve  
17 her. She indicated she sold the Property and is not at the address. *See* 12/3/2021  
18 Email from Dr. Mintas, attached as Ex. 4.
- 19 • **12/4/2021** Australian counsel has repeatedly requested that Defendant provide  
her residential address for service but those requests have been ignored. *See*  
12/4/2021 Emails between Dr. Mintas and F. Amirbeaggi, attached as Ex. 5.
- 20 • **12/6/2021:** U.S. counsel for PlayUp emailed a copy of the Order as well as the  
21 filings in this case to Defendant. *See* 12/6/2021 Emails from D. Berhanu,  
22 attached as Ex. 6.

23 On December 7, 2021, the Court granted PlayUp’s Motion for Extension of Time,  
24 requiring Defendant be served with the Order by December 20, 2021. (ECF No. 13.)

25 Despite Defendant’s failure to respond to prior emails from PlayUp’s Australian  
26 counsel and U.S. counsel, Defendant has communicated with PlayUp’s General Counsel,  
27 Ashley Kerr, from her email [dr.laila@mintas.net](mailto:dr.laila@mintas.net), as recently as December 9, 2021,  
concerning activities of PlayUp’s Board of Directors. *See* 12/9/2021 Emails from Defendant,  
28 attached as Ex. 7. Ms. Kerr has responded to these communications seeking Defendants’  
cooperation with providing a response to counsel’s requests for information on her address.  
At the same time, PlayUp’s Australian counsel has emailed her in a separate and final attempt

1 to obtain Defendant's cooperation with providing her address for service. *See* 12/9/2021  
 2 Email from F. Amirbeaggi, attached as Ex. 8. Defendant, however, has failed to respond.

3 In further attempts to effectuate service, on December 13, 2021, PlayUp's U.S. counsel  
 4 emailed the attorneys of record for Dr. Mintas in a pending Nevada State Court litigation<sup>1</sup> to  
 5 inquire whether the firm will also represent Dr. Mintas in the present case, but Anthony B.  
 6 Golden, Esq. of the law firm Garg Golden Law Firm disclaimed representing Dr. Mintas in  
 7 this litigation. *See* 12/13/2021 Email with Anthony B. Golden, Esq., attached as Ex. 9.

8 On December 14, 2021, Defendant appeared in a proceeding in the Federal Court of  
 9 Australia and advised that she is aware of both the Australian and Nevada orders restraining  
 10 her conduct. She confirmed her email address, [dr.laila@mintas.net](mailto:dr.laila@mintas.net), is her personal email  
 11 address. She also uses the email address, [dr.mintas@gmail.com](mailto:dr.mintas@gmail.com), and requested that she  
 12 receive Australian process through that email. *See* Hostetler Decl. at ¶ 15.

13 **LEGAL STANDARD**

14 Federal courts have found that a plaintiff's two or three attempts at personal service at  
 15 a proper place should fully satisfy the requirement of reasonable diligence and allow  
 16 substituted service to be made. *Board of Trustees for the Laborers Health & Welfare Trust*  
 17 *Fund for Northern California, et. al. v. Empire Engineering and Construction, Inc.*, 2021 WL  
 18 5609859, at 3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2021)<sup>2</sup>. *Cf. Tann v. Thecheap Name*, 2019 WL 40603371  
 19 (D. Nev. Aug. 28, 2019) (court notes that “[a]s long ago as 2002, the Ninth Circuit  
 20 acknowledged that trial courts were authorizing email as a form of substituted service under  
 21 the rule and it approved email as a ‘constitutionally acceptable’ substituted method of service

22  
 23 <sup>1</sup> *See Dr. Laila Mintas v. Betworks (US), LLC, et. al.*, Case No. A-21-843537-C in the Eighth Judicial  
 24 District Court in Clark County, Nevada.

25 <sup>2</sup> Courts typically allow alternative service after multiple attempts at personal service, or where it is  
 26 clear the nonparty has actual notice and is evading service. *See e.g., Chambers v. Whirlpool Corp.*,  
 27 2016 WL 9451361, at 2 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2016) (permitting alternative service where personal  
 28 service was attempted at least three (3) times and that nonparty was aware of and had received the  
 subpoena); *In re Subpoena to VaughnPerling*, 2019 WL 8012372, at 4 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2019)  
 (finding alternative service effective where plaintiffs personally served someone they believed was the  
 nonparty and where nonparty's communication with the parties and the court obviously demonstrated  
 he had received the subpoena); *Toni Brattin & Co. v. Mosaic Int'l, LLC*, 2015 WL 1844056 (N.D. Cal.  
 Apr. 9, 2015) (finding alternative service proper after party had attempted personal service at place of  
 business twice and at residence four (4) times).” *Emcyte Corp. v. Apex Biologix, LLC, et al.* 2021 WL  
 5507219 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 24, 2021).

1 upon an ‘elusive international defendant, striving to evade service of process’ that helps  
 2 ‘ensure the smooth functioning of our courts of law”’); *Neumont Univ., LLC v. Nickles*, 304  
 3 F.R.D. 594 (D. Nev. 2015) (court found substituted service of a defendant by email was proper  
 4 after plaintiff attempted to serve defendant at his parents’ home on two occasions and after  
 5 noting that defendant has responded to communications from his email address since the  
 6 beginning of the litigation. Court noted that email is the method of communications defendant  
 7 “utilizes and prefers” and thus is the method of service most reasonably calculated to reach  
 8 him).

9 Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e) provides that service is proper by serving an individual in  
 10 accordance with law of the state where the district court is located. *Huang v. Carney*, 2020  
 11 WL 8881742, at 3 (D. Nev. Jan. 9, 2020). This Court is located in the District of Nevada. The  
 12 Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure (“NRCP”), in turn, allow for service “through any alternative  
 13 service method” in Rule 4.4(b) as follows:

14 **(b) Court-Ordered Service.**

15 (1) If a party demonstrates that the service methods provided in Rules 4.2, 4.3,  
 16 and 4.4(a) are impracticable, the court may, upon motion and without notice to  
 the person being served, direct that service be accomplished through any  
 alternative service method.

17 (2) A motion seeking an order for alternative service must:

18 (A) provide affidavits, declarations, or other evidence setting forth  
 19 specific facts demonstrating:

20 (i) the due diligence that was undertaken to locate and serve  
 the defendant; and

21 (ii) the defendant’s known, or last-known, contact  
 22 information, including the defendant’s address, phone numbers, email  
 addresses, social media accounts, or any other information used to  
 23 communicate with the defendant; and

24 (B) state the proposed alternative service method and why it  
 comports with due process.

25 **ARGUMENT**

26 Plaintiff has diligently attempted personal service of the Order granting Emergency  
 27 Motion for Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order and/or Summons and Complaint on  
 28 Defendant on at least four occasions at Defendant’s last known address in Henderson,

3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
 Las Vegas, NV 89169

**LEWIS ROCA**

1 Nevada. *See* Ex. 1-3. Additionally, Plaintiff has attempted to obtain Defendant's current  
2 address and location through her active email address, [dr.laila@mintas.net](mailto:dr.laila@mintas.net). *See* Hostetler  
3 Decl. at ¶¶ 9-11. Defendant is able to receive and respond to emails at this address as she has  
4 replied to emails with PlayUp's General Counsel, Ashley Kerr, as recent as December 9, 2021  
5 regarding activities of the PlayUp's Board of Directors. *See* Hostetler Decl. at ¶ 12. But,  
6 Defendant has failed to provide her address for service as requested by Australian counsel.  
7 *See* Hostetler Decl. at ¶ 11.

8 Notwithstanding Defendant's apparent refusal to submit to personal service of the  
9 Order, according to a December 13, 2021 article in iGaming Business magazine titled "Mintas  
10 Refutes PlayUp Allegations and Pledges Legal Response", it appears that Defendant is aware  
11 of the contents of the Order as she has commented that "all claims mentioned in the filings  
12 are wrong." *See* Robin Harrison, *Mintas Refutes PlayUp Allegations and Pledges Legal*  
13 *Response*, iGAMING BUSINESS, December 13, 2021 attached as Ex. 10. In the article,  
14 Defendant refutes specific allegations of Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Ex Parte  
15 Temporary Restraining Order related to her alleged attempts to destroy a deal to sell PlayUp's  
16 assets and further comments that "the terms of the restraining order prevent her from  
17 commenting in full". *Id.* Dr. Mintas is also quoted making similar statements to USBets for  
18 an article published on December 13, 2021 where she provided a written statement that "all  
19 the claims mentioned in the filing are wrong, and [her] lawyers are working on filing shortly  
20 [her] response to those claims to tell the true story based on written evidence." *See*, John  
21 Brennan, *Australian Sports Betting Firm PlayUp Sues Its U.S. CEO in Federal Court*,  
22 USBETS, December 13, 2021 attached as Ex. 11. Dr. Mintas declined further remarks in the  
23 article after claiming "it would force [her] to make negative comments about the Australian  
24 leadership, which [she has] to restrain from because of [her] former employment contract and  
25 now the court order they put on [her]." *Id.*

26 From the contents of the aforementioned articles and statements made in the Federal  
27 Court of Australia on December 14, 2021, it is evident that Dr. Mintas is well aware of the  
28 restrictions which have been imposed by the Order. Yet, she has refused to provide her address

3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

**LEWIS ROCA**

1 or make herself available for service.

2 In light of Plaintiff's numerous personal service attempts, further personal service  
 3 attempts are likely impracticable and would be to no avail. *See* Hostetler Decl. at ¶ 16; *see*  
 4 *also* NRCP 4.2(a)(1)<sup>3</sup>. Accordingly, Plaintiff requests that it be permitted to serve the Order  
 5 via substituted service by mailing a copy of the Order to 11 Mountain Cove Court, Henderson,  
 6 NV 89052 and by emailing a copy to [dr.laila@mintas.net](mailto:dr.laila@mintas.net) and [dr.mintas@gmail.com](mailto:dr.mintas@gmail.com). In the  
 7 Federal Court of Australia, Defendant confirmed that her personal email address is  
 8 [dr.laila@mintas.net](mailto:dr.laila@mintas.net), but requested that she be served with Australian process at her other  
 9 personal email address, [dr.mintas@gmail.com](mailto:dr.mintas@gmail.com). *See* Hostetler Decl. at ¶ 15. Therefore,  
 10 service in this manner comports with due process as it is the method most reasonably  
 11 calculated to afford Defendant with notice of the entry of the Order and an opportunity to  
 12 respond.

13 **CONCLUSION**

14 For the foregoing reasons, PlayUp respectfully requests the Court grant this Motion,  
 15 authorize Plaintiff to accomplish substituted service on Defendant Dr. Laila Mintas as set forth  
 16 in this Motion and grant such further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

17 DATED this 14th day of December, 2021.

18 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP

19 /s/ Jennifer K. Hostetler.

20 Jennifer K. Hostetler  
 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
 21 Las Vegas, NV 89169  
 Tel: 702.949.8200  
 JHostetler@lewisroca.com

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiff PlayUp, Inc.*

23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27 <sup>3</sup> In the various attempts at service at Defendant's Property, a process server has not identified or made  
 28 contact with an individual who resides in the home to effect service under NRCP 4.2(a)(2). *See* Exs. 1-3.

3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
 Las Vegas, NV 89169

**LEWIS ROCA**